IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace Figs. 1, 2, 9, and 10 with substitute Figs. 1, 2, 9, and 10.

2

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 29, 2005. Claims 1-25 remain pending in this application. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that Claims 1-25 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have so amended the claims and believe them in condition for allowance at this time.

In response to the Office Action's objection to the disclosure for failing to include the preferred layout, Applicants gratefully acknowledge the suggestion, however respectfully decline to add headings/sections as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

In response to the Office Action's objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show N codewords having a neutral or zero running disparity, Applicants note that at least Fig. 4 depicts this as described in the specification from page 9, line 22 to page 10, line 2. Applicants respectfully request hat the objection to the drawings under 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

In response to the Office Action's objection to the drawings

under 37 CRF 1.121(d), Applicants respectfully request that substitute Figs, 1, 2, 9, and 10, containing labels in unlabeled boxes be entered. Applicants further request that the objection to Figs. 3 and 4 for not including labels be withdrawn, since these figures show graphs and labels are not required for the understanding of these figures. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all remaining objections to the drawings.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons: 1) Applicants have clarified whether the running disparity is performed in the pre-coder by the amendment to Claim 1; 2) the number of bits in each codeword is not material to the understanding of the invention, and is described for example, as 2 or a limited number in Fig. 4 and throughout the specification; 3) Figs. 3 and 4 as well as page 8, line 26 to page 10, line 2 of Applicants specification at least provide support for how pre-coded data are combined to form a RDS of zero disparity; 4) Page 5, paragraph 2 of Applicants' specification describes what a 17pp coder/decoder is. Applicants respectfully request that the § 112, first paragraph rejections be withdrawn, as ample support is provided in the specification to enable one of skill in the art to practice the invention.

10

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application. Please charge any additional fees which may now or in the future be required in this application, including extension of time fees and fees for claims added upon amendment, but excluding the issue fee unless explicitly requested to do so, and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By

Aaron Waxler, Reg. No. 48,027
(914) 333-9608
December 29, 2005